UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/593,064	09/15/2006	Aude Livoreil	09763.0020	6473	
22852 7590 11/12/2009 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP			EXAMINER		
			MATTISON, LORI K		
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1619		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/12/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Occurrence	10/593,064	LIVOREIL ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	LORI MATTISON	1619				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timil apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	<b>J.</b> lely filed  the mailing date of this α  ○ (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	- action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the mer						
closed in accordance with the practice under E.	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>36-74</u> is/are pending in the application	l.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
·	8) Claim(s) <u>36-74</u> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
	ammor. Note the attached office	Action of formal a	0 102.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		(1)				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (t).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori	•	ed in this National	Stage			
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not receive	d.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ite				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date  5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:						
i apei ivo(syrivian bate	o) 🔲 Oulet					

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group 1, claim(s) 36-55, drawn to an aqueous cosmetic comprising a polymer with at least two amine units, devoid of vinyl amine or vinyl amide, modified with a hydrocarbon segment that is hydrophilic or hydrophobic, wherein the segment is different from sugar and devoid of sulfur, silicone, amidino and the modification with the hydrocarbon segment is not carried out by means of a bifunctional spacer group.

Group II, claim(s) 56-58, and 65-74, drawn to a method of using a cosmetic composition comprising a cosmetically acceptable medium a polymer with at least two amine units, devoid of vinyl amine or vinyl amide, modified with a hydrocarbon segment that is hydrophilic or hydrophobic, wherein the segment is devoid of sulfur, silicone, amidino groups for softening hair.

Group III, claim(s) 59-64, drawn to a method of using a cosmetic composition comprising a cosmetically acceptable medium a polymer with at least two amine units, devoid of vinyl amine or vinyl amide, modified with a hydrocarbon segment that is hydrophilic or hydrophobic, wherein the segment is devoid of sulfur, silicone, amidino groups for improved deposition homogeneity on keratinic materials.

Art Unit: 1619

The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: They are not unified by a special technical feature. In the instant case, the composition of Group I has a segment different from sugar, while those used in the process (Group II) may have segments the same as sugar. Also, the methods of using the composition (Group II vs. Group III; i.e. softening hair and improving deposition) are different.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

Application/Control Number: 10/593,064

Page 4

Art Unit: 1619

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LORI MATTISON whose telephone number is (571)270-5866. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am-6pm (Monday-Thursday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward can be reached on (571)272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/593,064 Page 5

Art Unit: 1619

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Examiner, Art Unit 1619

/Anne Marie Grunberg/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1661

•